Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/761,237	WENDEL ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	JaNa Hines	1645
All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):		
All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel): 1) <u>JaNa Hines.</u> (3) <u>Ihomas Hartung</u> , mb, Fhb 2) <u>William Ruyer</u> (Afty) (4)		
(2) William Rayer (Atty) (4)		
Date of Interview: <u>09 July 2009</u> .		
Type: a)☐ Telephonic b)☐ Video Conference c)☑ Personal [copy given to: 1)☐ applicant 2)☐ applicant's representative]		
Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No. If Yes, brief description:		
Claim(s) discussed: Claims of record Identification of prior art discussed: Art of record, Livespop et al + Hull et al.		
$igcup_{i}$.		
Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) № N/A.		
Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:		
(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)		
THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.		
The prior art rejections, hivesey et al and spell et al, were discussed, in particular		
and dall et al, were discussed, in forticular		
the differences in their processes as		
consared to the claims and invention.		
the differences in their processes as consared to the claims and invention. also the differences in viability where the pion art does not produce viable alls.		
puor art does not promice viable and.		
	11/1/1	-(
b.S. Patent and Trademark Office	All full free	7/9/09
	Summary /	Paper No. 20090709
/Mark Navarro/		

Primary Examiner